DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 147 UD 013 183

AUTHOR	Feldman, Jack M.
TITLE	Race and Level of Abstraction of Disagreement as Determinants of Evaluation and Behavioral Intentions. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged, Technical Report Number 12.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISED-TR-12
PUB DATE	Jan 72
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Abstraction Levels; Behavior Standards; Beliefs; Classification; *Conflict; Cultural Factors; Goal Orientation; Group Norms; Interaction; Interpersonal Relationship; *Racial Differences; Racial Discrimination; *Role Perception; Social Behavior; *Values

ABSTRACT

This document reports a study conducted to test the hypothesis that the level of abstraction of agreements and disagreements influences evaluations of and behavioral intentions toward other persons with the most abstract the most important. A "level of abstraction" theory, which predicts importance effects, holds that values, norms, roles, and facilities (specific means for reaching goals) form a level of abstraction hierarchy, from most to least important in producing conflict. A second hypothesis was that the race of a stimulus person would be important only in the determination of relatively intimate behavioral intentions. Complex stimulus persons differing in all combinations of race (black-white) and same-opposite values (highly abstract), norms, role beliefs, and facilities beliefs (least abstract) were constructed. Hypothesis one was partially supported; a clear level of abstraction effect was found but facilities beliefs controlled more variance than expected. This operated in addition to a proportion-of-agreement affect. Hypothesis two was not supported; a race main effect was observed only for superordination-subordination scores; in addition, race interacted with values, norms, and roles to determine evaluation scores. Results were discussed in terms of the perception of goal interdependence versus contrience. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 072147

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

RACE AND LEVEL OF ABSTRACTION OF DISAGREEMENT AS DETERMINANTS OF EVALUATION AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS

Jack M. Feldman
University of Illinois

Technical Report No. 12
January, 1972

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5
from the Social and Rehabilitation Service
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C., 20201

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

UD 013183

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Preface

This report is part of a series which is concerned with the economically disadvantaged. We have shown, thus far, and will continue showing in reports to be published shortly, that economic disadvantages are associated with and presumably create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment which are different from non-disadvantaged groups. Such differences create barriers in communication between a disadvantaged employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees and his subordinates. Such barriers make it more difficult for such an employee to hold a job. If we are to rehabilitate such an employee we must train both the employee and the people in his job environment in ways which will reduce such barriers.

The present study explores the effects of different kinds of disagreements on interpersonal attitudes. It shows that the level of abstraction of the disagreements is an important influence on such attitudes. Generally, the more abstract the disagreement, the more negative is its effect. Race and type of disagreement also show certain interactions.

This kind of information is useful in constructing cultural training materials, since it tells us what we should emphasize in our training. Specifically, it tells us that we should emphasize the similarity in values between employers and employees, while putting less emphasis on disagreements at lower levels of abstraction. Emphasis on such similarity will have, in all likelihood, positive effects on interpersonal attraction, and will allow the trainees to learn about specific cultural differences without negative affect.

Harry C. Triandis

RACE AND LEVEL OF ABSTRACTION OF DISAGREEMENTS AS DETERMINANTS OF EVALUATION AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS

Jack N. Feldman

University of Illinois

A B S T R A C T

A study was conducted to test the hypothesis that the level of abstraction of agreements and disagreements influences evaluations of and behavioral intentions toward other persons with the most abstract the most important. A second hypothesis was that the race of a stimulus person would be important only in the determination of relatively intimate behavioral intentions. Complex stimulus persons differing in all combinations of race (black-white) and same-opposite values (highly abstract), norms, role beliefs and facilities beliefs (least abstract) were constructed. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported; a clear level of abstraction effect was found, but facilities beliefs controlled more variance than expected. This operated in addition to a proportion-of-agreement effect. Hypothesis 2 was not supported; a race main effect was observed only for superordination-subordination scores; in addition, race interacted with values, norms, and roles to determine evaluation scores. Results were discussed in terms of the perception of goal interdependence vs. contrience.

RACE AND LEVEL OF ABSTRACTION OF DISAGREEMENTS AS DETERMINANTS OF EVALUATION AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS[1,2]

Jack M. Feldman

University of Illinois

Introduction

It is generally agreed that interpersonal attraction (as measured by a variety of devices) is partially determined by attitudinal similarity, variously defined (Byrne, 1969; McGuire, 1969; and many others). However, it is not generally agreed that prejudice, defined by both evaluation and behavioral intentions measures, depends upon race--specifically, that race influences intentions to perform relatively intimate behaviors. Rokeach and his associates (Rokeach, 1961; Rokeach & Mezei, 1966; Rokeach, Smith, & Evans, 1960; Stein, Hardyck, & Smith, 1965) have argued that prejudice, defined primarily in terms of evaluation and friendship choice, is based entirely on belief differences, or the assumption of such differences, between blacks and whites. Mezei (1971) supported the intimacy hypothesis, originally proposed by Triandis (Triandis & Davis, 1965; Triandis, Loh, & Levin, 1966), and in addition showed that social pressure was responsible for the race effect, a finding not inconsistent with Triandis' position. This is especially true in light of Triandis and Triandis' (1965) investigation of cultural influences on the determinants of social distance.

Another unresolved issue in the interpersonal attraction literature is that of issue importance. In contrast to common-sense reasoning, it has been found (Byrne, 1969; Byrne & Nelson, 1964, 1965) that importance of an issue does not interact with agreement-disagreement, except under a very specific set of circumstances (Byrne, London, & Griffitt, 1968; Clore &

Baldridge, 1968). Triandis, Weldon and Gwynn (in preparation) have argued that disagreement may be used as a cue indicating a contrient relationship, one in which goal attainment by an individual prevents goal attainment by a second; agreement may imply interdependence, such that goal attainment by one means goal attainment by another. If this explanation has validity, it may be that attitudinal disagreement implies contrience or interdependence either in addition to or instead of providing immediate positive or negative reinforcement; thus, issue importance influences attraction when it is made extremely salient (Byrne et al., 1968; Clore & Baldridge, 1968), since it then permits a stronger judgment of the type of relationship.

Smelser (1963) has proposed a "level of abstraction" theory which clearly predicts importance effects, while at the same time dealing with non-attitudinal variables. He proposes that values, norms, roles, and facilities (specific means for reaching goals) form a level of abstraction hierarchy, from most to least important in producing conflict. From the Triandis et al. (1971) reasoning above, it may be argued that value disagreement indicates the most contrience, norm disagreement somewhat less, role disagreement still less, and facilities disagreement the least. Thus, disagreements at lower levels of abstraction should produce less negative evaluation of another person than disagreements at high levels of abstraction.

It is predicted that:

1. Agreement-disagreement on values, norms, roles and facilities will control decreasing amounts of variance in the determination of interpersonal evaluation and behavioral intentions.

2. Race will control a significant percent of variance only on relatively intimate behavioral intentions.

Method

Subjects

Thirty-four white male undergraduates participated in the study as part of a course requirement in introductory psychology.

Instruments

Agreement on values, norms, roles, and facilities was manipulated through two questionnaires designed to make the variables as salient as possible to the students. The first questionnaire was open-ended, and requested the student to write four or five sentences giving his own beliefs about political values, norms, roles, and facilities. He was also asked to write down those beliefs he considered most nearly opposite to his own. The subjects were given the following definitions of each variable:

Values. A person's basic beliefs about himself, who he should be, and how he should relate to nature, others, and society. For example, belief in revolutionary vs. evolutionary social change, or a belief in cleanliness.

Norms. Ideas about correct behavior applying to everyone in society. For example, a belief in non-violence, or a belief that everyone should keep his house clean.

Roles. Ideas about correct behavior which apply to persons having a particular position in a society. For example, a belief that students should be leaders in changing society, or that the wife should clean house.

Facilities. Ideas about appropriate means for achieving goals. For example, a belief that civil disobedience is a valid means of political expression, or that one should use only non-polluting detergents.

Political beliefs were chosen because these were felt to be most relevant to this particular subject population. If a church group were the subject population, perhaps moral beliefs would have been used.

The second questionnaire presented stimulus persons representing all possible combinations of agreement and disagreement on values, norms, roles, and facilities. Subjects were instructed to imagine that these stimuli were real people, and that "agreement" meant espousing the same beliefs the subject had written for himself, while "disagreement" meant a person espousing beliefs the subject had said were opposite to his own.

Because a completely crossed within-subjects design would have required too many judgments, "black" and "white" questionnaires were prepared. Thus, a subject responded only to white or black stimuli, except for four stimulus persons of the other race inserted into each booklet as the second, sixth, tenth and fifteenth pages. These other race stimuli were systematically varied in agreement on values and facilities, but always agreed on norms and roles. Other than this systematic placement, other stimulus persons were ordered randomly between booklets.

Subjects responded to each stimulus person on two types of scales: Beliefs and behavioral intentions. Beliefs were three items each from the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity scales of the Semantic Differential, presented as single words and rated on a 0 to 9 scale (0 = never true, 9 = always true). Behavioral intentions ratings were made on a 0 to 9 scale for three items from each of five factors of a Behavioral Differential (Triandis, Weldon, & Gwynn, in preparation). The factors were: Super-ordination-Subordination (command, obey [reverse scored], criticize); Hostility (exclude from neighborhood, reject as club member, refuse to introduce to your sister); Intimacy (reveal dreams that worry you to him,

discuss sex life with him, discuss intimate thoughts); Friendship (eat with him, be his close friend, gossip with him); Respect (admire his character, admire his ideas, ask for his opinion). Items were randomly ordered within the Belief and Behavioral Intentions categories.

In addition, subjects responded on a 0-10 graphic scale measuring the perceived likelihood of existence of the stimulus person (0 = impossible, 10 = certain) and gave a numerical estimate of the relative frequency of that combination of characteristics ("out of 100 randomly selected people, how many do you think would have these characteristics?").

Since the results dealing with Activity, Potency, Probability, and Relative Frequency are not directly relevant to the hypotheses, they will not be discussed further. Analyses of these variables showed patterns similar to the others. Interested readers may obtain tables from the author.

Procedure

Subjects were run in the evening, in one group. Questionnaires were randomly distributed among desks and subjects were seated systematically from front to rear in order of arrival.

The "Attitude Elicitation" (open-ended) questionnaire was given first. Subjects were assured of anonymity, and told that the belief elicitations were for their own use, which was true. Ss were also allowed to retain their elicitation questionnaires if they desired to do so.

The next section of the questionnaire dealt with behavioral intentions and evaluations. Subjects were told to respond as if they were faced with actual people who showed the given pattern of traits. The necessity for objective appraisal of one's own feelings was stressed. In essence, Ss were asked to take the role of an expert on their own behavior, rather than that of an experimental subject.

Results

Due to space limitations, only those results directly relevant to the hypotheses will be considered here. Data for each dependent variable was analyzed separately in a 2x2x2x2x2 analysis of variance, with race of stimulus person a between-subject factor and agreement-disagreement on values, norms, roles and facilities within-subject factors. Dependent variables were obtained by summing across relevant individual scales of the Semantic and Behavioral Differentials. Nineteen subjects rated black stimuli, and 15 rated whites.

Evaluation

As predicted by Hypothesis 1, no significant main effect of race was present ($F = 1.61$, $p < .21$). Significant main effects were obtained for agreement vs. disagreement on Values ($F = 40.19$, $p < .00001$), Norms ($F = 30.60$, $p < .00001$), Roles ($F = 19.99$, $p < .00009$), and Facilities ($F = 19.90$, $p < .00009$). The mean Evaluation scores for each main effect, together with percent-variance estimates (Hays, 1963), are presented in Table 1. With one reversal, Hypothesis 1 is supported. However, several significant interactions exist which cast some doubt on the original hypothesis, since no interaction effects between levels are predicted by the Smelser (1963) formulation. A Norm x Role interaction ($F = 7.40$, $p < .011$), a Value x Norm x Role interaction ($F = 5.09$, $p < .04$) and a Race x Value X Norm X Role interaction ($F = 5.01$, $p < .04$), while less important than the main effects, do occur and should be considered.

Insert Table 1 here

Table 2 presents the four-way interaction; the lower-order effects may be obtained by averaging appropriate cells. Interested readers may obtain a complete set of tables from the author.

Insert Table 2 here

Table 2 shows that blacks who agree over three issues are evaluated more highly than whites in the same position, but that blacks are evaluated lower than whites in all other cells. This may be because blacks are expected to disagree, and disconfirmation may be a pleasant surprise, much like agreement after a series of disagreements (Aronson & Linder, 1965; Stapert & Clore, 1969). It might also be that white subjects have a tendency to use any available negative evidence to lower their evaluation of blacks.

The within-race results indicate the presence of a proportion of agreement effect. Similar (in rank-order) evaluation scores are present in cells with zero, one, and two disagreements, regardless of issue. The level of abstraction effect clearly emerges, however, as a greater difference in evaluation between the agreement and disagreement cells for more abstract issues than between comparable cells for the less abstract issues.

Behavioral Intentions

Superordination-subordination. This variable was scored in the "superordinate" direction--that is, high scores indicate intentions to command, criticize, and not to obey the stimulus person. A main effect for race was found, indicating that whites would act in a superordinate manner to blacks (mean = 16.65) more often than to whites (mean = 14.32) ($F = 10.54$, $p < .003$; % variance = 9.3). Main effects for agreement-disagreement on values ($F = 11.34$, $p < .002$), norms ($F = 6.44$, $p < .02$), roles ($F = 8.75$, $p < .006$) and facilities ($F = 17.67$, $p < .0002$) were also found. Table 3 presents these main effects.

Insert Table 3 here

As can be seen from Table 3, the hypothesized level of abstraction effect is not obtained, though differences do exist. The race main effect may be due to the institutionalized subordinate role of the black; the fact that disagreement at the highest and lowest levels of abstraction account for equal amounts of variance is not so easily explained.

A significant Race x Facilities interaction effect is also present ($F = 4.88$, $p < .04$). Table 4 illustrates the effect. Disagreeing blacks are subordinated more than any other group, perhaps again due to the whites' belief that blacks should be subordinate to them. White resistance to black militancy is perhaps an example of this phenomenon.

Insert Table 4 here

Hostility

Four main effects, presented in Table 5, were found for this variable. No race main effect or interactions with race were obtained. Agreement-disagreement on values ($F = 40.40$, $p < .00001$), norms ($F = 15.20$, $p < .0005$), roles ($F = 13.23$, $p < .001$), and facilities ($F = 15.71$, $p < .0004$) lead to greater expressed hostility, as would be expected from the evaluation results.

Insert Table 5 here

Intimacy

Four significant main effects and two interactions were found for this variable. Disagreement on values ($F = 33.08$, $p < .00001$), norms ($F = 19.11$, $p < .0001$), roles ($F = 36.78$, $p < .00001$), and facilities ($F = 36.78$, $p < .00001$) lead to fewer expressions of intimate behavioral intentions, as presented in Table 6. Significant value x role ($F = 5.73$, $p < .03$) and norm x role ($F = 7.82$, $p < .009$) interactions are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Insert Tables 6, 7, and 8 here

These interactions once again illustrate a proportion of agreement effect, combined with an importance main effect, as predicted. More agreement leads to more expressed intimacy, but the level of abstraction also influences the amount expressed. Disagreement on more abstract issues leads, as predicted, to less intimacy than disagreement on less abstract issues.

The second hypothesis was not supported by these results, since no main or interaction effects involving race were significant.

Friendship

Four significant main effects and three significant interactions were found for the friendship variable. The main effects of values ($F = 55.77$, $p < .00001$), norms ($F = 32.16$, $p < .00001$), roles ($F = 35.57$, $p < .0001$), and facilities ($F = 34.46$, $p < .00001$) agreed with previous data, as Table 9 shows. Once again, percent of variance estimates were not exactly in accord with hypothesis 1, but a clear level-of-abstraction effect was obtained.

Insert Table 9 here

The value x facilities ($F = 7.75$, $p < .009$), norm x role ($F = 8.03$, $p < .008$) and value x norm x role ($F = 4.78$, $p < .04$) interactions reflect the same patterns noted earlier--proportion effects combined with level of abstraction effects. Tables 10, 11, and 12 show that agreement at higher levels of abstraction leads to more "friendship" responses than agreement at lower levels, though more agreement per se leads to higher ratings as well.

Insert Tables 10, 11, and 12 here

Respect

Results for this variable also agree with the previous analyses in giving partial support to hypothesis 1. The four main effects--values ($F = 56.15$, $p < .00001$), norms ($F = 48.30$, $p < .00001$), roles ($F = 55.84$, $p < .00001$), and facilities ($F = 46.79$, $p < .00001$) are all in the expected direction, though some reversals size of effect are present. Table 13 presents these main effects.

Insert Table 13 here

Proportion and abstraction level effects are once again obvious in the three significant interactions--values x norms ($F = 4.45$, $p < .05$), values x roles ($F = 4.80$, $p < .04$), and norms x roles ($F = 7.20$, $p < .02$). These are presented in Tables 14, 15 and 16.

Insert Tables 14, 15, and 16 here

These tables show that more rated respect goes with more agreement, but that agreement on a higher level of abstraction is "worth more" respect than agreement at a lower level.

Discussion

Although Smelser's (1963) hypothesis was not perfectly supported, the results of this study do indicate that level of abstraction of agreement-disagreement has a significant effect on interpersonal attraction and behavioral intentions. This effect appears to be similar to what Byrne (1969) has discussed under the topic of "issue importance."

Triandis et al.'s (1971) argument that agreement or disagreement is used as a cue indicating the likelihood of contrient or interdependent relationships remains the most parsimonious explanatory principle, especially in view of the specific issue used in this study. However, it should be remembered that the methodology used, which required subjects to predict their responses, may have favored a cognitive "expectancy" orientation rather than an immediate evaluative response to positive or negative reinforcement. One important question thus raised is the extent to which each orientation operates in actual interaction situations.

These results support the proportionality concept as well as the effect of levels of abstraction. The obtained interactions show a clear proportionality effect, in that more agreement leads to higher evaluation, less hostility, more respect, etc. The level of abstraction effect occurs in addition to the proportionality effect, adding or subtracting more or less evaluation, hostility, and so on, depending on the specific levels of agreement or disagreement. Once again, this is most easily explained by the contrience-

interdependence assumption. This may be made compatible with Byrne's (1969) reinforcement theory if it is also assumed that the perception of contrience leads to a high expectancy of negative reinforcement in actual interaction situations.

The results, at first glance, appear to weaken the Triandis and Davis (1965) position, since no race effect occurred on the Intimacy factor. However, if the specific scales involved in this factor are considered (reveal dreams, discuss sex life, discuss intimate thoughts), it becomes apparent that this factor represents intimate friendship rather than, say, heterosexual intimacy. The fact that no race effects occurred on the Hostility factor (exclude from neighborhood, reject as club member, refuse to introduce to sister) is more damaging, since these are similar to previous social distance items.

The important race main effect and the race x facilities interaction on super-subordination also disagree with the Triandis and Davis (1965) position, since these are relatively formal behaviors (command, [not] obey, criticize). Perhaps the best unifying principle was proposed by Mezei (1971), who showed that perceived social pressure was responsible for the race effect, where obtained. (Of course, the fact that no heterosexual items were included in this study may have prevented the occurrence of more race effects.) It may well be that norms or expectancies exist in the white population that blacks should be or will be subordinate to them. This may also be a social class effect, since there is evidence (Feldman, in press) that whites tend to expect blacks to be lower-class, unless evidence to the contrary is presented.

Of course, the Triandis and Davis (1965) results were based on a within-subject design, while the present results are the product of between-subjects comparisons. While an attempt was made to increase the salience of race by

including other-race "dummy" ratings in each booklet, this may not have been entirely successful. On the other hand, the Rokeach (1961) position is contradicted by the significant four-way interaction involving race, values, norms, and roles. Table 2 shows clearly that blacks are evaluated, cell for cell, less positively than whites, except where the black stimulus person agrees on values, norms, and roles. In this case the black is evaluated more highly than the white. This may be a contrast, or a "happy surprise" phenomenon.

Stein et al. (1965) showed that whites tend to regard blacks as different from themselves unless specific information to the contrary is provided. Thus, any disagreement from a black may be used as a cue indicating more extensive disagreement than would be expected from a white at the same level.

The fact that agreement vs. disagreement on facilities controlled more variance than predicted calls for some comment. Political "facilities," such as a belief in civil disobedience, may be relatively more important as indicants of contrience or interdependence than roles, since the particular facilities chosen may imply characteristics of the person, such as a willingness to use violence. This would obviously be a more important source of information than the belief that students or their elders should be the leaders in changing society (roles).

Based on these results, a more empirically correct order of importance might be values, then norms and facilities equally, and roles. Of course, this ordering may be specific to the political issue; in this context, facilities beliefs may be strongly related to values, since they are the means by which values are attained. Other topics, less abstract than politics, might not show the same ordering, since the value-facility connection is probably not as strong. "Cleanliness" is one example of a more concrete issue.

The effect may also be methodological. Aronson and Linder (1965) showed that positive statements after a series of negative evaluations lead to greater liking than totally positive statements. Byrne, Lamberth, Palmer and London (1969) interpreted this as a recency effect and presented data consistent with this approach. Since "facilities" was always presented last, agreement after a series of disagreements (values, norms and roles) could have lead to an overevaluation of the agreer on facilities, and thus to an increased percent-variance estimate. However, if this were the case, it seems likely that such an interaction would have been highly significant, with agreement on facilities alone producing an effect equal to that of agreement on several other levels. This, obviously, was not the case. Thus, while the hypothesis of order effects remains tenable, it is not likely to account for the results presented here.

This study has demonstrated clear abstraction-level effects, under circumstances where Byrne's (1969) theory would not have predicted their occurrance. This indicates that interpersonal attraction may be determined by more than proportion of agreeing responses. The theoretical explanation offered is, admittedly, not as well defined as Byrne's. Further work needs to be done to specify how the expectancy of negative or positive reinforcement is related to the perception of contrience or interdependence, and how these relate to the effectance model which presently dominates the literature on interpersonal attraction.

References

Aronson, E., & Linder, D. Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 156-171.

Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1967, 36-91.

Byrne, D., & Nelson, D. Attraction as a function of attitude similarity-dissimilarity: The effect of topic importance. Psychonomic Science, 1964, 1, 93-94.

Byrne, D., & Nelson, D. The effect of topic importance and attitude similarity-dissimilarity on attraction in a multistranger design. Psychonomic Science, 1965, 3, 449-450.

Byrne, D., London, O., & Griffitt, W. The effect of topic importance and attitude similarity-dissimilarity on attraction in an intrastranger design. Psychonomic Science, 1968, 11, 303-304.

Byrne, D., Lamberth, J., Palmer, J., & London, O. Sequential effects as a function of explicit and implicit interpolated attraction responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 70-78.

Clore, G. L., & Baldridge, B. Interpersonal attraction: The role of agreement and topic interest. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 340-346.

Feldman, J. M. Stimulus characteristics and subject prejudice as determinants of stereotype attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press.

McGuire, W. The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology. Vol. 3. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969, 136-315.

Mezei, L. Perceived social pressure as an explanation of shifts in the relative influence of race and belief on prejudice across social interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 69-82.

Rokeach, M. Belief vs. race as determinants of social distance: Comments on Triandis' paper. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 187-188.

Rokeach, M., & Mezei, L. Race and shared belief or factors in social choice. Science, 1966, 151, 167-172.

Rokeach, M., Smith, P., & Evans, R. Two kinds of prejudice or one? In M. Rokeach (Ed.), The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Smelser, N. J. Theory of collective behavior. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Stein, D. D., Hardyck, J. A., & Smith, M. B. Race and belief: An open and shut case. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 281-290.

Triandis, H. C., & Davis, E. E. Race and belief as determinants of behavioral intentions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 715-725.

Triandis, H. C., Loh, W. D., & Levin, L. A. Race, status, quality of spoken English, and opinions about civil rights as determinants of interpersonal attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 468-472.

Triandis, H. C., & Triandis, L. M. Some studies of social distance. In I. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, 207-217.

Footnote

1. The research reported here was supported by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5 (Harry C. Triandis, Principal Investigator).

2. The author would like to thank H. C. Triandis and G. L. Clore for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Table 1

Mean Evaluation Scores and Percent of Variance Estimates--Main Effects[a]

Factor	Mean Evaluation Score		
	Agree	Disagree	% Variance[b]
Values	15.23	12.83	9.7
Norms	14.90	13.16	5.5
Roles	14.73	13.34	3.2
Facilities	14.83	13.24	4.2

[a]Means in this and all succeeding tables are rounded to the second decimal.

[b]% variance refers to the term "Omega-squared" (Hays, 1963) in this and all succeeding tables; all estimates are rounded to the first decimal.

Table 2

Cell Means in the Race x Values x Norms x Roles Interaction on Evaluation

Black Stimuli

	Values	Agree		Disagree	
	Norms	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	17.57	14.30	13.70	11.77
	Disagree	14.16	13.97	13.03	10.50

White Stimuli

	Values	Agree		Disagree	
	Norms	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	17.07	14.92	15.11	13.05
	Disagree	15.26	14.37	13.05	12.05

Table 3

Mean Super-Subordination Scores and Percent of Variance Estimates--Main Effects

Factor	Agree	Disagree	% Variance
Values	14.74	15.96	2.4
Norms	15.01	15.69	0.7
Roles	14.95	15.75	1.0
Facilities	14.75	15.96	2.4

Table 4

Cell Means in the Race x Facilities

Interaction--Super-Subordination

		Race of Stimulus Person	
		Black	White
Facilities	Agree	15.69	14.00
	Disagree	17.61	14.64

Table 5

Mean Hostility Scores and Percent of Variance Estimates--Main Effects

	Mean Hostility Score		
Factor	Agree	Disagree	% Variance
Values	6.21	9.03	4.4
Norms	6.65	8.59	2.0
Roles	6.97	8.26	0.8
Facilities	6.68	8.56	1.8

Table 6

Mean Intimacy Scores and Percent of

Variance Estimates--Main Effects

Factor	Agree	Disagree	% Variance
Values	8.54	6.25	5.0
Norms	8.37	6.42	3.6
Roles	8.17	6.62	2.2
Facilities	8.46	6.32	4.4

Table 7

Cell Means in the Value x Role

Interaction--Intimacy

		Values	
		Agree	Disagree
	Agree	9.58	6.75
Roles			
	Disagree	7.49	5.75

Table 8

Cell Means in the Norm x Role

Interaction--Intimacy

		Norms	
		Agree	Disagree
	Agree	8.99	6.96
Roles			
	Disagree	7.22	6.36

Table 9

Mean Friendship Scores and Percent of

Variance Estimates--Main Effects

Factor	Agree	Disagree	% Variance
Values	14.06	10.94	8.6
Norms	13.68	11.32	4.9
Roles	13.61	11.39	4.3
Facilities	13.69	11.31	5.0

Table 10

Cell Means in the Value x Facility

Interaction--Friendship

		Values	
		Agree	Disagree
Facilities	Agree	15.62	11.76
	Disagree	12.50	10.13

Table 11

Cell Means in the Norm x Role

Interaction--Friendship

		Norms	
		Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	15.15	12.08
	Disagree	12.22	10.57

Table 12

Cell Means in the Value x Norm x Role

Interaction--Friendship

		Values			
		Agree		Disagree	
	Norms	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	17.46	13.41	12.83	10.75
	Disagree	13.37	12.01	11.07	9.12

Table 13

Mean Respect Scores and Percent of

Variance Estimates--Main Effects

Factor	Agree	Disagree	% Variance
Values	13.97	10.16	11.0
Norms	13.52	10.61	6.5
Roles	13.37	10.76	5.0
Facilities	13.75	10.38	8.7

Table 14

Cell Means in the Values x Norms

Interaction--Respect

		Values	
		Agree	Disagree
Norms	Agree	15.77	11.26
	Disagree	12.18	9.05

Table 15

Cell Means in the Values x Roles

Interaction--Respect

		Values	
		Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	15.62	11.13
	Disagree	12.33	9.19

Table 16

Cell Means in the Norms x Roles

Interaction--Respect

		Norms	
		Agree	Disagree
Roles	Agree	15.21	11.53
	Disagree	11.82	9.70